

**Section III:**

**AMENDMENT UNDER 37 CFR §1.121 to the  
DRAWINGS**

No amendments or changes to the Drawings are proposed.

**Section IV:****AMENDMENT UNDER 37 CFR §1.121****REMARKS****Summary of the Interview**

During the telephone interview on April 29, 2008, we explained the intention of our amendment to further specify the aspects of our invention regarding the plurality of our cloned sites, the content router, and the advantages of redirecting booking parties to a cloned site where the cloned site is tailored for use by the particular booking party, as illustrated in our Figure 2.

We then explained our understanding of the Mankes reference regarding their single clone and their segregation of site functionality by password, not by redirection to a plurality of clones where a clone is tailored for a specific type of booking party.

The Examiner indicated general understanding and agreement to these interpretations of the Mankes reference, and pointed out that the newly-added first step in Claim 1 could be problematic in its interpretation. He suggested that the Markush group could be interpreted as I had explained our intentions to be, or that it could be interpreted differently, such as having three clones all of the same type (e.g. all three tailored to wholesale booking parties, or all three tailored to consumers, etc.).

This was very helpful insight, so we discussed possible ways to revise the language to clarify the claim bounds. The supplemental amendment made herein adopts those revisions.

We are grateful for the Examiner's time and suggestions, and we stand by to consider any changes or issues the Examiner may find during formal reconsideration of the rejections.

Respectfully,



Robert H. Frantz  
U.S. Patent Agent, Reg. № 42,553  
Tel: (405) 812-5613  
Franklin Gray Patents, LLC